

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 11-14, 37 and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The offending claims have been amended to correct the errors noted by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torrey et al. in view of Snelling et al. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper.

Reference to claim 1 of the currently pending claims reveals that claim 1 recites:

"a communication unit comprising a first wireless transceiver port... and a first expansion interface in communication with said first wireless transceiver port and operable to communicate with a second communications unit on a plurality of communications channels to permit said second communications unit to access the first wireless transceiver.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Torrey et al. nor Snelling et al. taken alone or in combination disclose a first expansion interface in communication with said first wireless transceiver port... to permit said second communications unit to access the first wireless transceiver.

Torrey et al. disclose a premises telephonic interface system for communicating using a hand-held wireless device. Snelling et al. disclose a home personal communication

system intended to connect to a plurality of PSTN lines and to use a radio transceiver to communicate with various remote transceivers connected to line-type telephony equipment to enable such equipment to have access to any of the subscriber lines. The Snelling et al. patent indicates that the invention meets the need of providing a wireless in-house telephone system designed to provide multi-line phone operations allowing the consumer to set up a multiple phone multiple line system without having to use wired phone connections running through the building. (Column 1, line 47-51 and column 1, line 60.)

The Examiner has noted that Torrey et al. do not teach the operation of more than one communications unit. Applicant also wishes to point out that Torrey et al. also fail to disclose or suggest a communications unit that has a first expansion interface in communication with the first wireless transceiver port and operable to communicate with a second communications unit on a plurality of communications channels to permit the second communications unit to access the first wireless transceiver, as recited in claim 1. In particular, none of the telephonic devices shown in Figure 2A, for example, appears to communicate with call processor 223, for example, on a plurality of communications channels. Consequently, item 223 of Torrey is not like the first expansion interface recited in applicant's claim. Furthermore, there is no suggestion that it should communicate with a second communications unit on a plurality of communications channels. Rather, it appears that only one channel is used, in that telephonic devices 231, 232 and the switching element 225 appear to be connected to the same telephonic interface 268 as shown in Figure 2B. Thus, each of the telephonic devices and the switching element 225 appear to be like "extensions" on a single telephone line. There is no disclosure or suggestion that such extensions should communicate on a plurality of communications channels.

The Examiner's comments with respect to Snelling et al. do not provide a clear indication of the features of Snelling that the Examiner believes to correspond to the elements of applicant's claim. The Examiner has merely paraphrased sub-paragraph b) of claim 1 with no indication of the elements of Snelling et al. that the Examiner

believes correspond to the elements of the claim. The Examiner has referred to Figure 3 of Snelling et al. as being pertinent to the words "first wireless transceiver", however, the only radio transceiver shown in that Figure is a TDD/TDMA radio transceiver for communicating to remote wireless subscriber loop interfaces that provide connectivity to fax machines, modems, conventional telephones, etc. Nowhere is it suggested that the radio transceiver of Snelling et al. be operable to conduct wireless communications with a wireless base station. Consequently, it is not clear what the Examiner regards as the first expansion interface and the first wireless transceiver port in the combination of references provided. Furthermore, it is not clear how Torrey et al. could be modified by the teachings of Snelling et al. to arrive at the claimed invention. It is noted that Snelling et al. issued well prior to Torrey et al. and therefore, if applicant's invention were obvious, surely Torrey et al. would have recognized it at the time they filed their patent application. Consequently, applicant respectfully submits there is no motivation to modify the teachings of Torrey et al. with the teachings of Snelling et al. to arrive at the claimed invention and therefore the rejection of claim 1 is improper. Claim 1 is not obvious and should be allowable.

Claims 2-24, which are dependent on claim 1, should also be allowable due to this dependence and due to the additional subject matter they claim. In general, the applicability of the references to these claims is still unclear as the Examiner has not clearly indicated elements of Snelling et al. that correspond to elements recited in the claims.

Regarding claim 4, as stated above, none of the references disclose the first expansion interface claimed in claim 1 and therefore there can be no suggestion to place such first expansion interface and first wireless transceiver port on a common base as recited in claim 4.

Regarding claim 6, this claim has been amended to depend from claim 5 and recites the communications unit of claim 5 further comprising a first communications appliance interface operable to communicate with at least one of the first wireless

transceiver and said first expansion interface to permit a communications appliance connected to said communications appliance interface to communicate with the wireless base station or another communications unit in communication with said first expansion interface. There is nothing in the references to suggest that a communication appliance connected to the communication unit should be selectively able to communicate with the wireless base station or another communications unit in communication therewith.

Regarding claim 9, there is nothing to suggest that the first expansion interface and the first communications appliance interface are selectively operable to use the first wireless transceiver port.

Regarding claim 10, this claim has been amended to recite the communications unit of claim 6 wherein the first expansion interface is operable to support independent communications between another communications unit and the wireless transceiver while supporting independent communications between another communications unit and said first appliance interface. None of the references discloses this.

Regarding claim 13, none of the references disclose or suggests a communications unit wherein the first expansion interface is programmable to cause said first wireless transceiver port to selectively communicate with one of a plurality of communications units operable to communicate with said first expansion interface.

Regarding claim 23, this claim recites that the processor circuit is programmed to communicate said dialed digits to said first wireless transceiver interface in response to a change in the rate at which dialed digits are received at said communications appliance interface. None of the references discloses rate-dependent communication of dialed digits.

In connection with claim 24, none of the references discloses or suggests that the apparatus should include a processor circuit programmed to communicate the dialed

digits to said first wireless transceiver interface in response to expiry of a timeout period after entry of said dialed digits at said communications appliance.

The Examiner has applied the rejections set forth in connection with claim 1 to claim 25. Claim 25 differs from claim 1 in one respect in that it recites a system for providing multiple access to a wireless transceiver. The system includes a plurality of communications units, at least one of which includes a first wireless transceiver port as recited in connection with claim 1 and a first expansion interface in communication with the first wireless transceiver port and operable to communicate with said plurality of communications units on a plurality of communications channels to permit said plurality of communications units to access the first wireless transceiver. The language of the body of the claim is similar to that found in claim 1 and therefore arguments similar to those presented above in connection with claim 1 apply. Nevertheless, none of the references discloses or suggests multiple access to a wireless transceiver connected to the first wireless transceiver port, the multiple access being provided by the plurality of communications channels which communicate with the unit having the first wireless transceiver port.

Claim 26 indicates that each of the communications units comprises a communications appliance interface operable to communicate with the first wireless transceiver port. Notwithstanding that neither reference discloses a first expansion interface as claimed, none discloses that each of the communications units has a communications appliance interface operable to communicate with the first wireless transceiver port.

Claim 27 recites that at least some of the communications units have respective wireless transceiver ports operable to be accessed by any of said communications appliance interfaces. Note that the language "at least some of the communications units" indicates that there is more than one wireless transceiver port operable to be accessed by any of the communications appliance interfaces. This allows a communications appliance interface on one communications unit, for example, to

access a wireless transceiver port on another of said communications units. None of the references discloses or suggests this.

Regarding claim 28, none of the references discloses that any of the communications appliance interfaces can access any of said wireless transceivers through respective expansion interfaces on respective communications units on which any of said communications appliances are located and respective communications units on which said wireless transceivers are located. This permits, for example, a communications appliance interface on one communications unit to access a wireless transceiver associated with another communications unit. None of the references discloses this ability to provide multiple transceivers and multiple communications appliance interfaces.

Claim 29 recites that any of said communications units is operable to receive programming information from other communications units to configure any of said communications units to selectively make its wireless transceiver port and its communications appliance port communicate with a wireless transceiver port or a communications appliance port of at least one other of said plurality of communications units. Thus, not only is communications facilitated between transceivers and communications appliance interfaces on different communications units, programming of a first expansion interface in a given communication unit can be programmed by other communications units. None of the references discloses this.

The arguments set forth above in connection with claims 1-7 apply equally to claims 30-36, respectively. In addition, the arguments presented above in connection with claims 9-19 apply equally to claims 37-47. In addition, the arguments presented above in connection with claims 22-24 apply equally to claims 48-50. In addition, the arguments provided above in connection with claim 25 also apply to claim 51, and the arguments in connection with claims 27, 28 and 29 apply equally to claims 52, 54 and 55, respectively. Claim 53 recites supporting communications between wireless transceiver ports on at least some of said communications units and communications

appliance interfaces on at least some of said communications units. Thus, more than one wireless transceiver port can be communicating with a respective communications appliance interface that is not on the same communications unit as the wireless transceiver port with which it is communicating. None of the references discloses this.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted the Examiner's rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the applicability of the indicated references and to withdraw the rejections based thereon. If the Examiner disagrees with the applicant, the Examiner is requested to clearly indicate, preferably by numerical reference number or by reference to columns and line numbers of the cited references, the specific correspondences between claim elements and disclosure in the references that the Examiner relies on to support the allegation that the claims are obvious.

Other Matters

Claims 2, 5, 10, 19-24, 27-29, 35, 38, 54 and 55 have been amended for clarity and not for reasons related to patentability.

New Claims

New claim 56 has been added to add an additional limitation to the first wireless transceiver port recited in claim 1. Support for this claim is provided on page 6 at lines 27-28 and page 7 at lines 1-2.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely

filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit
account no. 12-0415.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
deposited with the United States Postal Service as
first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner
of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C., 20231 on:

April 16, 2003

(Date of Deposit)


Michael O. Rasmussen

(Name of Applicant, Assignee or Registered Representative)


(Signature)

04/16/03
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Michael O. Rasmussen

Agent for Applicant

Reg. No.: 52,155

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036
323-934-2300